

entitled: "Vacant space will cost \$167,000 a month". It refers to the moving of certain public servants across the river. I am not commenting upon the policy of government buildings being decentralized out of Ottawa to Hull or other places; I am commenting upon the lack of good management—that there should be a tremendous waste of buildings already available. I am commenting upon the fact that there should have been better planning and phasing in of the program so that taxpayers' funds are not wasted in such a manner.

There are other examples of government waste. I should like to refer to one which has been localized and raised in the House before. It is an ad which appeared in a small weekly newspaper in my constituency. I believe this ad has appeared in every weekly and daily newspaper in Saskatchewan recently. The one I have in my hand appeared in a weekly publication known as the *Foam Lake Review* on March 14, 1979. It is an ad which could be almost labelled a political one, except that it is paid for by the Government of Canada. It is in the name of the Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang) of Transport Canada. The ad is entitled: "Can Canada really export 1¼ billion bushels of grain a year by 1985?". The ad refers to the tremendous achievements of the government in the last few years by building export capacity for the movement of grain. I should like to know how much such an ad costs.

**Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** It pretends to be an article.

**Mr. Nystrom:** As the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands has stated, it looks like an article. There was another such ad in Vancouver. It referred to saving thousands of dollars on car fuel over the next five years if one could. It was in the name of the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Gillespie), the honourable czar of energy. There are various ads of that sort. I see the hon. member for Battleford-Kindersley (Mr. McIsaac) smiling. He is really very ashamed about this.

What about PRAC? PRAC was established by the Minister of Transport to look at rail line abandonment in the prairies. I should like to quote from the ad wherein it refers to PRAC. It reads as follows:

You can fight for unprotected branch lines several ways, starting right now. Here is what you can do:

1. Form a local retention committee. Co-operate with other retention committees on the same rail line.
2. Study the reasons why the Hall commission or PRAC recommended abandonment. You may find an important mistake or you may find the situation has changed.

Many mistakes have been made by the Prairie Rail Action Committee. The ad continues:

3. Let the western arm of the CTC know you plan to defend a line. It will be alerted that people are interested in saving a line and want a hearing.

The minister could be saying this in press releases and in speeches. One can go back to the fact that most of the lines should not be abandoned in the first place. It continues:

The western arm of the CTC can deny an application for abandonment for five years or so. The western arm of the CTC can also recommend to the

### *Waste and Mismanagement*

Minister of Transport that a line should be added to the permanent network, guaranteed into the next century.

The Minister of Transport can add lines to the permanent network.

One must remember the cost of such ads to taxpayers. This type of thing makes Canadians very, very cynical about government, the management ability of politicians, bureaucrats and public servants. That makes me very sad because I do not think Crown corporations, governments or public servants are any less capable of managing money than the private sector. I do not think they are any less capable of planning the economy than the private sector. It is ads such as this which lessen the credibility of government as an institution. They lessen the credibility of people who are involved in public life and manage the funds of the country. It is nothing less than a blatant political ad. The government is sticking its hand and greedy fingers into the pork barrel in an attempt to be re-elected in a few ridings in western Canada.

**An hon. Member:** That is the way to do it.

**Mr. Nystrom:** I wish the hon. member opposite would rise to his feet and say that this is the way the government should go about doing things for the country.

In a debate of this type we should look at the priorities in managing money which the government has set. It is not only that the government wastes money, but we should look at its priorities. It is willing to give millions of dollars to professional hockey teams for rinks, but when a small town wants to build a rink for amateur sport, suddenly it meets the government's restraint program head on. I ask why?

● (1550)

Then look at what is being done about medical research in this country. Again, this has been cut back. When we look at the problems the native people have, and problems in respect of Indian housing, again we see that we are running into restraints. I think that is mismanagement of government funds.

Millions of dollars are being handed to the pulp and paper industry in spite of the fact that these companies are making profits and are not broke. Still they are receiving over \$200 million in public funds. I think that is mismanagement of government funds.

When I look at the gifts the government opposite gives the huge corporations I am reminded of the fact that this government has probably borrowed more money abroad than any government in the past in order to prop up the falling Canadian 85-cent dollar, about which the government boasts sometimes. It is now printing a new \$20 bill which is not worth much more than the dollar of a few years ago. This government has borrowed billions of dollars to defend the falling dollar, and we are now paying all kinds of interest on that borrowed money. At the same time this government is deferring corporate income taxes. That is money this government could use to reduce this huge deficit, money that could be used